

Remarks:

Applicants have read and considered the Office Action dated March 16, 2005 and the references cited therein. A three-month extension of time is enclosed herewith. Therefore, the time period for response extends up to and includes September 16, 2005.

Claims 1-12 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 13-24 have been added. Claims 13-24 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been entered hereby. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

A. Telephone Interview with the Examiner

On September 12, 2005, Applicants' representative, Nicholas P. Johns, conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner. Issues related to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101 were discussed, and proposed claim language was discussed. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy and cooperation extended during the interview.

B. Drawings and Specification

The drawings were objected to as the Office Action alleged that the specification does not describe the drawings in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to understand the drawings. The disclosure was also objected to because it does not conform to standard U.S. practice.

It is noted that the drawings have been amended to include reference numerals. Further, the specification has been amended to make reference to the drawings. Applicants have further amended the specification to include headings that frame the specification's organization. No

new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicants assert that the objections to the drawings and specification are traversed.

C. Claim Objections

Claims 1-12 were objected to because the claims are not presented in form consistent with current U.S. practice. Claims 1-12 have now been canceled without prejudice and claims 13-24 have been added. In view of the cancellation, the rejection is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection. Applicants assert that claims 13-24 are in proper form.

D. §101 Rejection

Claims 1-12 were rejected under §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants traverse this rejection. Claims 1-12 have now been canceled (Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection). In view of the cancellation, the rejection is now moot. Further, new claims 13-24 recite structures sufficient to satisfy the requirements of patentable subject matter under §101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

E. §112 Rejection

Claims 1-12 were rejected under §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. Applicants traverse this rejection. Claims 1-12 have now been canceled (Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection). In view of the cancellation, the rejection is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Applicants assert that claims 13-24 overcome the indefiniteness rejections.

It is noted that the amendments discussed in this section were not made to overcome art-based rejections. Accordingly, such amendments should not be construed in a limiting manner.

F. §102 Rejection

Claim 1 was rejected under §102 as being anticipated by the publication "A 'Paradoxical' Identity-Based Signature Scheme Resulting from Zero-Knowledge" by Guillou et al., Applied Cryptography, Second Edition by Schneier, and U.S. Patent 5,140,634 to Guillou et al. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has now been canceled (Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection). In view of the cancellation, the rejection is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants take this opportunity to proactively comment upon the cited prior art, in view of pending claims 13-24. Applicants respectfully point out that each of the independent claims require "calculating the private values Q_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$ by solving either the equation

$G_i \cdot Q_i^v \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ or the equation $G_i \equiv Q_i^v \pmod{n}$, wherein the public exponent v is such that $v = 2^k$." Applicants observe that none of the cited prior arts teaches or even suggests this step. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 13-24 are patentably distinct from the cited prior art, and should be allowed.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

Conclusion

This response is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the currently pending claims. Although certain arguments were set forth supporting the patentability of the claims, Applicants note there may be other reasons and arguments that the original claims and the pending claims are patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise any such argument in the future and to pursue any claim scope in the future that is supported by the disclosure set forth in the application.


If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicants' representative at 612.336.4728.



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
612/332-5300

Date: 9/16/05



Gregory A. Sebald
Reg. No. 33,280
GAS/krm

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1A-1D and Figs 2-4. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheets Showing Changes